

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 15, 18, 19 and 22 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 22 over Loeffler in view of Nantz

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,074 to Loeffler et al. ("Loeffler") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,291,968 to Nantz et al. ("Nantz"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 22 recite a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key.

The Examiner acknowledges that Loeffler fails to disclose a key chain rechargeable device that is distinct from a key inserted in said key securing structure and adaptively attaches to a key chain (See Office Action, page 3). The Examiner relies on Nanz to allegedly disclose the deficiencies in Loeffler to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nanz appears to disclose a vehicle security system 20 that adaptively attaches to a key chain (See Fig. 2). The key chain security system 20 is inductively charged by a base station 34 (See Nanz Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 50-54). The base station 34 is located at the base of the automobile's windshield within the dash of the vehicle (See Nanz Fig. 1).

Inductive charging systems conventionally produce a very small charging field, requiring a rechargeable device to be placed very near an inductive coil. Therefore, Nanz's key chain rechargeable device would have to be placed very near to the base station 34 to recharge the battery therein. Since Nanz's base station 34 is located within the dash of the vehicle (Fig. 1), the key chain security system 20 would have to be placed on the top of the automobile's

dash for charging. Placing the security system 20 on top of the automobile's dash for charging would not allow charging while the automobile is being operated, a very inconvenient system for charging the security system 20. Nantz's fails to disclose or suggest a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claims

Thus, Loeffler modified by the disclosure of Nantz would still fail to disclose or suggest a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claims

A benefit of a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key is, e.g., convenience and safety. As discussed above, Nanz's key chain electronic device would have to be placed on top of an automobile's dash for charging. Placing a key chain electronic device on top of an automobile's dash would not allow operation of the automobile while the key chain electronic device is being charged, a very inconvenient system. Moreover, leaving a key chain electronic device on top of the automobile's dash for charging prevents locking of the automobile (unless the owner has two keys, which is further inconvenience). Leaving an automobile's keys on top of the dash in an unlock car to charge a key chain electronic device potentially allows the automobile to be stolen.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 22 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 over Loeffler in view of Nantz and Hansson

In the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Loeffler in view of Nantz, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,775 to Hansson ("Hansson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 8 recites a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key.

As discussed above, Loeffler modified by the disclosure of Nantz fails to disclose or suggest a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

The Office Action relies on Hansson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Loeffler modified by the disclosure Nantz to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hansson appears to disclose an apparatus, system and method that notifies a user of a low battery condition when a remaining battery capacity of a portable electronic device falls below a predetermined level (Abstract). A location for charging the electronic device is monitored by using GPS, GSM short range radio interface, and Bluetooth (Hansson, Abstract).

Hansson is relied on to disclose a key chain rechargeable device that is a BLUETOOTH network device (See Office Action, page 6). However, Hansson fails to even mention use of an inductive charging system, much less a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

Thus, Loeffler modified by the disclosure of Nantz and Hansson would still fail to disclose or suggest a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock

device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 8 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 over Loeffler in view of Nantz and Holcomb

In the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Loeffler in view of Nantz, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,855,534 to Holcomb et al. ("Holcomb"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 recites a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key and is a penlight.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that Loeffler in view of Nantz fails to disclose a key chain rechargeable device that is a penlight device (See Office Action, page 7). The Office Action relies on Holcomb to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Loeffler in view of Nantz to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagrees.

Holcomb appears to disclose a method and apparatus for providing power to portable radio transmitters (Abstract). A special clip arrangement is build into the base of a transmitter itself for connection of a penlight cell (Holcomb, col. 1, lines 3-11).

Holcomb discloses use of small batteries, e.g., penlight battery cells. Holcomb discloses penlight battery cells NOT a penlight, much less a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 11.

Thus, Loeffler modified by the disclosure of Nantz and Holcomb would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 11.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22 over Suyama in view of Fernandez

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,561,331 to Suyama et al. ("Suyama") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,651 to Fernandez et al. ("Fernandez"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22 recite a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key.

The Examiner acknowledges that Suyama fails to disclose inductive charging of a rechargeable device/battery (See Office Action, page 8). The Examiner relies on Fernandez to make up for the deficiencies in Suyama to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fernandez discloses inductive charging of portable devices including pagers, two-way radios, cellular phones and wireless communicators (See col. 1, lines 13-21). However, Fernandez fails to disclose or suggest application of an inductive charging system to anything related to a lock device, much less a system and method of placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22.

Thus, since neither Suyama (as the Examiner acknowledges) nor Fernandez disclose or suggest application of inductive charging to anything related to a lock device, Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 over Suyama in view of Fernandez and Hansson

In the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Suyama in view of Fernandez, and further in view of Hansson, U.S. Patent No. 6,323,775 ("Hansson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 8 recites a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key.

As discussed above, Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez fails to disclose or suggest application of inductive charging to anything related to a lock device, much less disclose, teach or suggest a system and method placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

The Office Action relies on Hansson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hansson appears to disclose an apparatus, system and method that notifies a user of a low battery condition when a remaining battery capacity of a portable electronic device falls below a predetermined level (Abstract). A location for charging the electronic device is monitored by using GPS, GSM short range radio interface, and Bluetooth (Hansson, Abstract).

Hansson is relied on to disclose a key chain rechargeable device that is a BLUETOOTH network device (See Office Action, page 12). However, Hansson fails to even mention use of an inductive charging system, much less a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

Thus, Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez and further in view of Hansson fails to disclose, teach or suggest a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 8.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 8 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 over Suyama in view of Fernandez and Holcomb

In the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Suyama in view of Fernandez, and further in view of Holcomb. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 recites a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key.

The Examine correctly acknowledged that Suyama fails to disclose a key chain rechargeable device is a penlight device (See Office Action, page

13). The Office Action relies on Holcomb to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagrees.

Holcomb appears to disclose a method and apparatus for providing power to portable radio transmitters (Abstract). A special clip arrangement is build into the base of a transmitter itself for connection of a penlight cell (Holcomb, col. 1, lines 3-11).

Holcomb discloses use of small batteries, e.g., penlight battery cells. Holcomb fails to disclose or suggest use of a penlight, much less a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 11.

Thus, Suyama modified by the disclosure of Fernandez and further in view of Holcomb fails to disclose, teach or suggest a system placing a key chain electronic device in charging range of an inductive coil when a key is inserted in a lock device, the key chain electronic device being distinct from the key, as recited by claim 11.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307

WHB/df